

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MINUTES
JANUARY 10, 2011

Chairman George Infanti called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. Selectmen present: Dwight Brew, James O'Mara, Thomas Grella and Bruce Bowler. Also present: Town Administrator Gary MacGuire and Executive Assistant Sharon Frydlo.

Mr. Infanti announced that he was pleased that they had reached a tentative agreement between the Police Union and the Town of Amherst for the years 2012 and 2013 and will have the details posted on the Town's website in the near future. He acknowledged Police Chief Peter Lyon and Town Administrator Gary MacGuire for the year and a half to two years of very hard work, along with Attorney Tom Closson, Policemen John Smith, Mike Knox and Pat Webster, as well as AFSCME Negotiator Steve Lyons.

Mr. O'Mara moved to ratify the agreement between the Town of Amherst, Amherst Police Department and AFSCME Local 3657. The date of the agreement will be July 1, 2011 and expires on June 30, 2013, second by Mr. Bowler. Discussion: Mr. O'Mara noted that the details will be on the website and the Union has not had an agreement since 2009 and spans four years for the Police Department. He was looking forward to making a presentation at the public hearing. ***Vote: Unanimous.***

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Citizens' Forum

Peter Eiche, of Ways & Means, expressed his personal thanks for inviting Attorney Drescher several weeks ago to explain in detail the relationship between the Library and the Town and was a great idea. This was one meeting that wasn't televised and it was his suggestion to put it on a CD and if someone has any questions, hand them the CD. Mr. Infanti remarked that this was not a foolish question, as Mr. Eiche noted and the questions were relevant.

Don Holden, Library Trustees Chairman, told the Board that he understood there was an email sent to him about some people wanting to have a warrant article separating the Library budget from the Town budget. He was unsure if it was to be done this year or in a future year and he thought this should be addressed in public. The Trustees have been coming to the Selectmen for many years and this was their last meeting before the Deliberative Session. The points, as they understand them, was that certain people thought they needed to separate the Library from the Town budget which was to separate governance and transparencies. They liked working with the Board and look at the Library budget when there were Town issues. The Department Heads work with the Library Director and have a good ongoing working relationship throughout the year. The voters do not want to see a long list of different warrant articles that were in addition to the Town budget. They have an excellent relationship with the Board of Selectmen because they know how this works. They were a little disappointed about not having openness and incurred additional legal expense for something they didn't think was a problem and didn't know how this happened.

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

Presentation by Health & Human Services Agency Review Committee

Chairman Rick Katzenberg advised his Committee put together a report with back up of considerable data represented by a questionnaire titled "Description of Social Services Provided to Amherst, NH" that he briefly described. The questions on the survey were asked of the 14 agencies that had made funding requests. The report contained a synopsis of each agency, the contact person and title, the funds requested and the services given. The total requested was \$47,000, however, the prior year total was \$59,345 with the biggest deletion being Parkhurst Place, who was self-funding their programs this year due to the tightness of the economy. The \$59,000 that showed up in Article 40 as \$35,000, he indicated he never

had been very clear how they get from \$59,000 to \$35,000, and had a decrease this year of half of one percent.

Mr. Katzenberg noted that over 1,000 Amherst citizens received social services from these agencies. The demand was up higher. The agencies' funding sources are being reduced and they were the only town in their region that said "no". Every other town in their region said they would fund these agencies. If they fund these organizations at these levels, they receive tremendous value. He remarked that many of these organizations were providing their services at sharply reduced costs than what was provided. These services should be provided in the Town budget and it was not logical or moral to be placed in a warrant article.

Mr. Katzenberg read his personal reflections contained in the report. He thanked the Selectmen, his Committee – Liz Morgan, Peter Stearns, Judy Gilliland, Sue Spiess and Brooke Demarest, who helped him organize the report. Mr. Infanti thanked him very much and his Committee for their quick and hard work.

Board members took the time to look over the written presentation. Mr. Brew knew Mr. Katzenberg's desire was to roll it into the operating budget. Unfortunately, last year it was defeated and he would be uncomfortable putting it in the operating budget. He would like to see a warrant article and when it passes in subsequent years, be put into the operating budget. Mr. Katzenberg felt if this was done, it would not pass, as people do not know what they are voting on. If you ask people what was Bridges, would they know what that agency did. Mr. Brew mentioned that he gave the people in Amherst more credit. Mr. Bowler agreed with Dwight and used the road bond as an example. With education done by the Committee, he believed it would pass. Mr. O'Mara appreciated what they did in a very short period of time. Prior to becoming a member of the Board, there was a situation, the Board heard frequently, "no means no", and then the Selectmen were chastised. He believed they could encourage voters to vote favorably for these agencies and believed other Departments would not be hurt. He remarked that he would do his best to make sure they were included in the budget in subsequent years. He asked Mr. Katzenberg if he would object if the Selectmen would use his report at the Deliberative Session. It was important that people see information that was made available to the Board and make people more aware.

W&M: Jack Kunkel advised the Committee was split on this and will discuss it before the Deliberative Session. Their initial straw vote was that they were split on incorporating this into the budget. Some folks felt that people contribute to the charities of their choice privately. David Chen asked Mr. Katzenberg if he was saying, instead of him giving his funds to a certain agency, he was saying give them to the ones "we tell you to support". Mr. Katzenberg thought the protection of health and welfare of the citizens in Town falls outside the avenue of property taxes. The Town doesn't get much in Federal and State subsidy, support ourselves through Town taxes and as a result they have to take care of each other. It will take time to get everybody up to speed on these agencies. Mr. Chen asked that with the agencies he was proposing, did they also solicit funds from the individual citizens in Town. Mr. Katzenberg was not sure, many do not solicit funding, such as Host Homes.

Mr. Kunkel indicated that he should expand on the vote – the people who voted in favor were really in favor of it being in the budget and those who voted "no" believe in private solicitation. Peter Eiche believed this began about 25 years ago, when one organization came to the Town requesting \$1,500 and at Town Meeting it passed. Over the years a number of organizations have been added to that list. Those funds were always in the Town budget. Two years ago it was taken out of the Town budget for a variety of reasons. When you take it out, you start the process all over again as Dwight suggested. The trouble now that presents the problem was that voters were becoming less tolerant of warrant articles because they have so many. If it was going to be a warrant article again this year, he hoped it passes and they put it back into the budget. They have a \$10 million dollar budget and there were services that are provided

to all the citizens such as the Library, Conservation and Recreation. He asked if the majority services were for the elderly. Mr. Katzenberg noted that the classic example without age was the Visiting Nurses, there were some that were clearly designed to help children in need and some designed to help the elderly. He would say the mix was clearly across the board including income.

Finalization of Town Warrant

Mr. MacGuire advised most of them have seen and discussed the warrant articles already, but they had not been in this form because of the Union negotiations. They will also see recommendations that were universal and placeholders.

Article 22 – Bridge Replacement Bond: Nothing has been changed since the first presentation and the numbers provided were from Director Berry for the replacement of two bridges. Mr. Infanti noted that they were having a public hearing for the budget and bond and they will see the numbers on slides so that people can see them. Mr. O'Mara asked if they would be including a commentary describing the magnitude in order to get a favorable vote. Mr. Infanti thought a brief synopsis was all that was needed. Mr. Brew mentioned that when this was discussed earlier, there was a concern of what the interest and principal was if they bonded the roads and bridges and that the over all borrowing was not to exceed the \$4 million dollars that already has been authorized. He thought that it important to either explain that was the plan or legally insert a sentence that they wouldn't exceed the borrowing that had been authorized for next year. Mr. Infanti thought they could put it in an explanation. Mr. Bowler summarized that the article says "up to \$4 million dollars", it didn't have to be \$4 million dollars and it was up to their discretion what to expend. Mr. O'Mara remarked that they could ask Legal Counsel if it was possible. Mr. MacGuire advised that this would be presented at next week's budget and bond hearing. The language could be inserted then and he could pose this question, because they had the authority to go up to \$4 million dollars. Mr. Brew preferred having it legally in the article, because the commentary was not going to be on the ballot. Mr. O'Mara indicated that they could ask the question and take input from the public. As the Selectmen had the authority to make changes to the budgets and warrant articles, they could then make them and present them at the Deliberative Session. Mr. Infanti believed this was what they were going to do Monday night. He spoke briefly about the three bridges that were to be reconstructed at the cost of \$2,100,260. What the Selectmen were requesting and their intent, was to reduce the road bond and defer it to the future. ***Mr. O'Mara moved that Article 22 be place on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Brew.***

Discussion: Director Berry told Mr. Kunkel that he had made the statement that this was the full cost of three bridges they anticipated, but there were no guarantees that the New Boston Road Bridge over Beaver Brook would be taken off the red list this summer. It had been recommended that it be put in the article and if it passed, the money would not be spent. He told Mr. Chen that they had spent somewhere near \$27,000 for the bridge repair and would get 80% back from the State in the next ten or twenty years. There were some differences between the State estimate for replacement and what may be required for stream water crossings. Liz Overholt suggested using actual dollar amounts added to a tax bill, when talking about the \$2 and \$4 million dollars. Mr. Infanti told Mr. Eiche that he didn't believe there were any restrictions for a time period, because time was of the essence, otherwise they wouldn't be doing that. ***Vote: Unanimous.*** Mr. Bowler asked if W&M had taken a position on this article. Mr. Kunkel advised not on the Bridge Article because they hadn't seen it yet.

Article 23 – Operating Budget: Mr. Infanti advised that the operating budget was at \$10,299,569 and the default budget was at \$10,136,943. ***Mr. Bowler moved to put Article 23 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella. Vote: Unanimous.*** Mr. Kunkel reported that W&M voted 6-0 on the operating budget, even though they still feel it was under-funded and wanted to make sure they sell it.

Article 24 – Police Union Contract: *Mr. Bowler moved to place Article 24 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella. Vote: Unanimous.* Mr. MacGuire noted there will be more details for next week’s public hearing. The first year cost for 2012 was \$82,988, the additional estimate for the second year of the two year contract was \$28,522.

Article 25 – Public Health Mosquito Surveillance and Control Program: Mr. Infanti advised the amount of this article was for \$40,000. *Mr. Bowler moved to place Article 25 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella. Vote: Unanimous.* Mr. Kunkel reported W&M unanimously supported this by 6-0, but the feeling was that it should be in the budget. Charlene Carper thanked Gary and Brian for getting the report to them.

Article 26 – Lease/Purchase of Recue/Pumper for Fire Department: Mr. Infanti indicated the amount associated with this article was \$154,223. Mr. MacGuire advised this article had changed. If they recalled, last time it was presented it was after Town Counsel’s review, but prior to DRA’s review. They had proposed about \$294,000 and were going to use \$150,000 from the existing Capital Reserve for the first year payment. DRA disallowed this. The Capital Reserve could only be used for the last year payment for a municipal lease and not for a first year payment. He proposed to change it to a four year lease, which was why the numbers had changed to \$154,223 and will not prevent them, four years from now, to use the Capital Reserve money for the final payment. He told Mr. Brew that the issue was the municipal lease with the escape clause. They could turn this into a regular lease and the change would be from a majority vote to a two-thirds vote. In theory, they could put the \$150,000 on a truck that could go away in future years. Mr. Brew indicated it seemed to him that they were paying interest on the amount they were borrowing when they already have money in the bank. *Mr. Bowler moved to put Article 26 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella.* Discussion: Fire Chief Boynton noted that the first payment was due when they picked up the vehicle. Mr. Brew commented that they used to pay all the money in advance using the Capital Reserves and then they went to a four year municipal lease and paying it over four years. “Unless they do something else, it is a slope we are going down and makes me a little bit uncomfortable”, he said. Mr. MacGuire indicated it could be a three-year municipal lease and in their discussions they were talking about putting \$150,000 in the Capital Reserves and continue doing this to maintain the levels across the board for the taxpayer. *Vote: Unanimous.*

Mr. MacGuire told Mr. Eiche that the Board would have to find another source for funding the last warrant article that would pay off the vehicle if it didn’t pass. Mr. Kunkel reported that W&M’s vote was 5-1 on the old warrant article that was written.

Mr. Infanti asked if the Selectmen concurred, to move the articles out of order as there were people in the audience that were present to either speak to the article or listen to the discussion and vote.

Article 33 – Souhegan Valley Transportation Collaborative Subsidy: *Mr. Bowler moved to put Article 33 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella.* Discussion: Mr. O’Mara noted it was in the amount of \$5,500. *Vote: Unanimous.* Mr. Kunkel advised W&M supported it unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Article 35 – Authorize the Amherst Conservation Commission to expend funds to qualified organizations: Bruce Beckley, Conservation Commission member, told the Board there were two articles in front of them from the Commission. Both would make it easier for the Commission to protect natural open space. Neither of them have a tax impact and both were permitted under State law passed last year. An example of a “qualified organization”, would be working with the Amherst Land Trust or the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests. The ACC recently participated in an important land transfer, the Hammond land purchase, with the understanding that a Conservation easement would be placed on it. The Commission and three other parties worked with them to protect this property.

Article 36 – Authorize the Amherst Conservation Commission to expend funds for land purchases outside Amherst: Mr. Beckley advised that this article relates to purchasing land rights crossing municipal boundaries. They had been working with a landowner for 15 years whose land crosses both sides of the Town line. They own land in Merrimack, part of the Ackley and Bragdon Farms and was not a new step. Under the law, both of these articles have to be accepted by the voters. Mr. MacGuire advised that what was in the proposed warrant came from Town Counsel when he met with him on Friday prior to Conservation’s meeting the night before. The language was different than what the ACC approved last night. Counsel says there is explicit language based on the RSA change last year and the reading of it is a bit different than what the Commission proposed. Mr. Beckley explained that they request using “adjoining towns”. Mr. MacGuire remarked that he was not sure this would be supported by Town Counsel, because he was uncomfortable as this was a brand new RSA with explicit language. He told Mr. Beckley that this language was straight out of the enabling RSA and they should stick with it word by word.

Mr. Brew moved to place Article 35 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. O’Mara. Vote: Unanimous.

Mr. Brew moved to place Article 36 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella. Vote: 4-0, Mr. Bowler opposed.

Mr. Brew mentioned that there was another warrant article that was sent to Gary. Mr. MacGuire indicated that he was correct. It was dealing with tax-deeded easements and came to his attention at the end of last week. When he met with Town Counsel, he had mentioned it to him and Attorney Drescher thought it was not legal for them to be doing this. He told Mr. Brew that Jim Bowen had on and off conversations with him that day. Mr. Brew summarized that the bottom line requests from ACC, Town Counsel felt wouldn’t fly.

Mr. Infanti noted that the Library Trustees were in attendance. He asked if there was a warrant article being presented for them to address. Mr. MacGuire advised that he was aware there were two petition articles that were presented that day and had not been verified as to the number of voters that signed it and it doesn’t appear that they will be discussed then. Mr. Bowler indicated that the Board usually makes no comments on petition articles. Mr. O’Mara remarked that as a Selectman he didn’t want to discuss them, but would reserve the right to do so as a citizen. Mr. MacGuire added that he didn’t put them on the warrant because they have to be approved by the Supervisors of the Checklist. Mr. Kunkel invited the Library Trustees to meet with Ways and Means downstairs if they so chose.

Article 27 – Funding for Recreation Land Purchase – Transfer from LUCT Fund to Recreation Fields Acquisition and Construction Capital Reserve Fund. Mr. MacGuire advised he had not seen anything on this when he went to meet Town Counsel on Tuesday, looking for LUCT funds for \$250,000. It was talked about by Recreation and their intent was to put it into a Capital Reserve. What the Board was seeing was different language, but still seeking to transfer LUCT funds and instead of “expending”, put them into a Capital Reserve account. Up until last week, he indicated he was confused. He thought this article met their intent. Mr. O’Mara noted that essentially it was a transfer of funds from one fund to another. Specifically to find space for the loss of Cemetery Fields and this was the first step in this direction. Mr. Kunkel asked if there was this much money in the LUCT fund. Mr. O’Mara believed there was \$380,000. Mr. Kunkel then asked if this was the money that was supposed to be split 50/50 with Conservation. Mr. MacGuire advised that they already have their portion. Mr. Eiche wondered what was accomplished by moving it from one fund to another. Mr. O’Mara explained that it was part of the education process. If it stays in the LUCT fund, it just stays there and there would be no education involved. Mr. Bowler noted that this requires the Selectmen’s approval. Mr. MacGuire added that it would allow the Selectmen to approve it and were also the agents to expend. Mr. Eiche assumed it would

cost more than \$250,000 to purchase land and wondered why not transfer all of the funds. Mr. O'Mara mentioned that they had this discussion and the Recreation Commission wanted to be reasonable and not appear to be gluttonous. This amount was selected based on last year's article that was significantly trounced. Again, it was an educational process. **Mr. O'Mara moved to put Article 27 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Brew.** Discussion: Mr. Bowler indicated he would not support the article because it did not call for a public hearing. Mr. Infanti noted that the LUCT money could be used for the cemetery as well. Mr. O'Mara asked if the Trustees came forward to ask for it. Mr. MacGuire reminded the Board that LUCT funds were used for a project and those funds can be used for anything as long as it was a legal purpose. After a brief discussion on whether or not LUCT funds could be used only for certain purposes, Mr. MacGuire advised that Town Counsel says LUCT funds could be put into a Capital Reserve. This proposed article was a Town Counsel one and DRA has not seen this because it changed since the warrant has been sent to DRA. Mr. Infanti remarked that his concern was the same as Bruce's of doing this without a public hearing. They have a right to spend it, but he also assumed they should have a public hearing too. He would not like to spend money without input from the public. Mr. Brew noted that procedurally not to go forward, it was dead. If they can go forward, they could do some more research. If they had some questions and felt they could be answered, they could vote it forward that night and re-visit it next week. The Board further discussed whether or not these changes could be made at that time. Mr. O'Mara commented on the bureaucracy of having to wait 12 months when a prime piece of property was made available. He noted that OSAC had dissolved when they were unable to make timely purchases based on the timeframe. He didn't want to lose sight of the fact that it becomes a part of an education process and is to make aware of things that don't get talked about whenever they meet. He didn't want this to be a lost cause and he didn't want to jeopardize anything else on the warrant. The Recreation Commission asked him to come forward with this and he has done so. **Vote: 4-1, Mr. Bowler opposed.**

Article 28 – Discontinue Cemetery Capital Reserve Fund: Mr. Infanti noted the amount was for \$14,230. **Mr. Bowler moved to put Article 28 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella.** Discussion: Mr. Brew's fear was that people will vote "yes" on 28 and "no" on 29. Mr. MacGuire advised that the original article as presented by Town Counsel for consideration was for one article and DRA indicated they had to have two. When Counsel listened to her arguments, he agreed. **Vote: Unanimous.**

Article 29 – Establish Forest View Cemetery Design Expendable Trust for \$14,230: Mr. Bowler moved to put Article 29 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella. Vote: Unanimous.

Article 30 – Ambulance Capital Reserve for \$22,000: Mr. Bowler moved to put Article 30 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella. Vote: Unanimous. Mr. Kunkel reported W&M were unanimous 6-0.

Article 31 – Communications Center Capital Reserve Fund for \$5,000: Mr. Bowler moved to put Article 31 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella. Discussion: Mr. O'Mara mentioned software and wondered if it could also be used for a tower. Mr. MacGuire advised it had fairly broad wording. **Vote: Unanimous.** Mr. Kunkel reported W&M were in favor 6-0.

Article 32 – Town Computer System Capital Reserve Fund: Mr. Bowler moved to put Article 32 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella. Vote: Unanimous. Mr. Kunkel noted W&M by 6-0 were in favor.

Article 34 – Health and Human Service Agencies: Mr. O'Mara moved to put Article 34 on the warrant for the public hearing, second by Mr. Grella. Discussion: After a clarification was made by

Sharon on the total amount, Mr. MacGuire advised the total would be changed from \$47,996 to \$46,996. Mr. Brew asked if it was the Board's intent to put it into the operating budget. **Mr. O'Mara accepted this as an amendment to his motion.** Mr. MacGuire indicated his intent was to go to Town Counsel and ask this question.

Mr. Chen asked if the same language could be used in Article 25. After a brief discussion, EMS Director Gleason was asked to clarify that his intent was to always renew the Mosquito Surveillance and Control Program as a warrant article because it was an ever-changing prediction. He spoke about the first year situation in Amherst. His recommendation, that he thought he had articulated, would be to always continue and renew and bring it forward only if they need it. Mr. Eiche asked if he would leave it as a warrant article permanently. The Director explained there were some communities that automatically roll it in because of their wetlands and salt marshes that were breeding grounds for EEE and West Nile Virus. If the status changes to moderate or remote, his recommendation would be to discontinue it in Amherst. He told Mr. Eiche that the State would provide them with a category and he would then make a decision. He also told him that it was much more difficult to sell gong from \$40,000 up to \$120,000 in a budget. By utilizing a warrant article, they can actually put forth a factual article without have the Board explain a 50% increase and easier for him as Health Officer. **Vote on Article 34: Unanimous.** W&M was 2 in favor 4 against.

Mr. Kunkel asked, that in terms of soliciting W&M's votes, did they want them for the public hearing. Mr. MacGuire acknowledged that it would be nice for them to have when they could get them to him.

The Board took a brief recess at 8:45 p.m. They resumed their meeting at 8:53 p.m.

Accept Unanticipated Funds

Mr. O'Mara moved to accept unanticipated funds in the amount of \$100 courtesy of Uniroyal, second by Mr. Grella. Vote: Unanimous.

Mr. Brew moved to accept Conservation's Matching Trail Grant Funds from Damian & Isabel Gunther in the amount of \$10.00, second by Mr. Bowler. Vote: Unanimous.

Minutes

Mr. O'Mara moved to accept the minutes of January 3, 2011 as written, second by Mr. Bowler. Vote: Unanimous.

Other Business

Mr. Bowler and Mr. Grella had nothing to report. Mr. Brew reported on the Conservation Commission's meeting the night before, where they had discussed the articles they proposed that night.

Mr. O'Mara had nothing to report on meetings, but he asked for a moment to express his appreciation to Don Holden regarding his thoughts on the petition warrant articles. They will reserve an opportunity to review them and express their feelings at a later date on the petition to pull out the Library budget out of the operating budget and vote on it, as well as the petition to vote to get a sense of what the Town wants. Mr. MacGuire mentioned that they had something similar last year from Jack Kunkel on having a referendum on SB2 that had no legal effect. Mr. Brew asked if at next Monday's meeting do the petitioners speak to the petition, as well as the Library Trustees. Mr. MacGuire replied "yes".

Mr. Infanti noted that next week would be a fairly busy night. Carolyn Quinn wanted to put together a little program as a closure for the 250th Anniversary. There was a brief discussion on Selectmen's meeting dates prior to the Deliberative Session on February 9. Mr. MacGuire indicated he had nothing scheduled for February 24th. There was a brief discussion about whether or not they should put the closure of the Anniversary Celebration off to the following week. Sharon was asked to call Mrs. Quinn and ask what date would be best for her.

Mr. MacGuire reported he had some discussion with Dwight and others about putting forth an effort for a presentation as a prelude to the Deliberative Session. They only have one week's notice and he didn't know the Board's wishes on how much preparation and if everybody would get some information to him. If this was a more normal year they would have a month to prepare, but they only have one week. He was looking at this as a step in the process to the Deliberative Session. Mr. Brew informed the Board that the School District used the public hearing as a rehearsal, they would film it and make improvements because the Deliberative Session was one of their big chances. He thought this Session was watched by a lot of people between the public hearings and the Deliberative Session. Mr. O'Mara indicated he was willing to step up and put together some material for the warrant. He listed the number of articles he was willing to work on, Mr. Infanti indicated he would work on a few of the ones Jim would do since they pertained to Cemeteries that he was Liaison to. Relative to the operating budget, Mr. MacGuire indicated they will prepare a summary sheet as well as having information on the default budget and focus on major differences. They will give a snapshot of the bond and interest payments and highlight some of those items. Mr. Infanti indicated there was just so much they can do in a week. Mr. Bowler remarked that if it was three weeks ago, it might have been a little bit different.

Mr. MacGuire advised that the Department Heads would continue to work with him between now and the Deliberative Session and the more folks can contribute between now and then the better the product was. He briefly talked about a slide presentation of the actual article along with a brief explanation of it and they maybe able to put something together because they had been talking about it.

After a brief discussion on what Selectmen would prepare and discuss at the public hearing, ***Mr. Bowler moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:11 p.m., second by Mr. Grella. Vote: Unanimous.***

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Frydlo
Executive Assistant